DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 352 EA 003 754

AUTHOR Coleman, Peter
TITLE School District Reorganization in the Mid-Island Region; Finance and Community Involvement. School Districts 65 (Cowichan), 66 (Lake Cowichan), 67 (Ladysmith), and 68 (Nanaimo).
INSTITUTION British Columbia School Trustees Association, Vancouver.
PUB DATE Jul 71
NOTE 67p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Community Involvement; Educational Accountability; *Educational Finance; Enrollment; Parent Participation; School Budget Elections; *School District Autonomy; *School Redistricting; Special Services
IDENTIFIERS British Columbia; Canada

ABSTRACT

This study examines the purpose of the school district structure and the manner in which it reflects the expectations of citizens for their school system. The document focusses on the community involvement and financial aspects of reorganization and examines (1) the basic pattern of school district reorganization in North America to find some common factors; and (2) the concepts of local control and accountability, as they relate to the notion of community involvement in school districts. Three main sets of criteria are used as organizing principles: educational, financial, and community involvement. The report concludes with some possible reorganization plans for the region under study. (Author/MLF)

ED055352

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EA 003 754

B.C. school trustees association

Reorganization of British Co

The M Finance Co

by Peter Coleman

ED055352

SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION IN THE MID-ISLAND REGION: FINANCE AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

65 (Cowichan) 66 (Lake Cowichan)

67 (Ladysmith) 68 (Nanaimo)

by

PETER COLEMAN

British Columbia School Trustees Association

July, 1971

CONTENTS

	PAGE
SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	4
THE RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY	
Community and Society	6
Accountability	13
Assessment and Implications	20
SOME CRITERIA FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION	25
Educational Criteria	27
Financial Criteria	30
Community Involvement Criteria	33
AN EXAMINATION OF TWO POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES	36
One Large District	39
Two Medium-Sized Districts	45
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Conclusions	51
Recommendations	52
LIST OF REFERENCES	55
APPENDIX A - THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION COMMITTEE: A VANCOUVER PROPOSAL	57
APPENDIX B - THE FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF PROPOSED SCHOOL DISTRICTS "A", "B", AND "C" BASED ON 1971 FIGURES	59

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Comparative Financial Statistics for all School Districts in British Columbia with enrolment of 10,000+ and 2,500-.....	31
II	Referendum History of School Districts Participating in the Study, January 1, 1966, to Present.....	34
III	Financial Statistics of the Proposed School District "A", Encompassing the Present Districts of Cowichan, Ladysmith, and Nanaimo.....	43
IV	Financial Statistics of the New Proposed School District, based on the Recommendation by Mr. Roy Stibbs - (SD #68 (Nanaimo)).....	47
V	Financial Statistics of the New Proposed School District, based on the Recommendation by Mr. Roy Stibbs - (SD #65 (Cowichan)).....	49
VI	Financial Statistics of the Proposed School District "A", Encompassing the Present Districts of Cowichan, Ladysmith, and Nanaimo - 1971 Figures.....	60
VII	Financial Statistics of the New Proposed School District, based on the Recommendation by Mr. Roy Stibbs - (SD #68 (Nanaimo)) - 1971 Figures.....	61
VIII	Financial Statistics of the New Proposed School District, based on the Recommendation by Mr. Roy Stibbs - (SD #65 (Cowichan)) - 1971 Figures.....	62

SUMMARY

This study examines school district organization in the mid-island region, that is, the area embracing School Districts #65 (Cowichan), #66 (Lake Cowichan), #67 (Ladysmith), and #68 (Nanaimo). The study examines the purpose of the school district structure of educational organization, and the way in which it reflects the expectations of citizens for their school system. The underlying tendencies for district reorganizations in North America are examined, and the conclusion is drawn that to serve current needs, as felt and expressed by most educators and citizens, school districts need to be large, that is, of about 15,000 student enrolment.

This size seems ideal to satisfy the needs expressed in most communities for a wide range of educational services and programs, and an educational system capable of producing students well-prepared for a life in society at large. The alternative view, of an educational system intended to serve primarily a small, "natural community", seems no longer viable in most instances.

The study also examines the notions of "local control" and "accountability", as they relate to school district size. The important element of community involvement seems closely related to these notions, and some suggestions were made regarding methods of strengthening this quality of a school district regardless of size.

Financial evidence regarding school district size was examined with some care, and it seems very probable that school districts in British Columbia operate most economically when they are quite large, - 10,000 pupils or more. Small school districts are more expensive to operate, even when they provide a smaller range of educational services and programs.

The study then proceeds to examine two alternative reorganization possibilities for the mid-island region. The first of these, the preferred one, is the creation of a single large school district embracing School Districts #65, #67, and #68. This would result in a school district of some 18,000

students and would provide the enrolment for an extremely strong and effective school district which would be able to provide an education of the first quality for the students of the region. The main arguments in favour of this large region are educational and financial, but there is no reason to suppose that from the point of view of community involvement this new large school district would be worse off than the existing school districts. In fact, if the appropriate provisions were made for extensive community involvement, it could be substantially superior to the existing districts in this respect.

The second reorganizational alternative examined consists of the proposal recommended in the Stibbs' Report. In this reorganization, School District #67 (Ladysmith) would be split along the North Cowichan Municipal Boundary, with the northern part being amalgamated with School District #68 (Nanaimo), and the southern part amalgamated with School District #65 (Cowichan). This would result in the creation of a large district in the northern region, and a medium-sized district in the southern region. In the view of this consultant, neither of these districts would be potentially first-class districts, since financially the northern one would be somewhat weak, and the southern one would be too small.

Ths school district not so far discussed, School District #66 (Lake Cowichan), is felt to constitute a community school system, in the sense already referred to. It has achieved a very high degree of community support and involvement, and although educationally and financially it is somewhat less than satisfactory, the importance of the community involvement criterion seems to justify its continuation as an independent school district, at least for the time being.

In the case of the large district recommended, there are several important subsidiary recommendations. These have to do with an open boundary system for the high schools, and a semester system. There are both educational and community involvement reasons for these recommendations; in this way, senior secondary program offerings could be retained at the small schools

in Chemainus and Ladysmith, and this is felt to be extremely important for the people in these communities, since it would reduce the busing that would otherwise be necessary in a reorganized district.

INTRODUCTION

This study of school district reorganization in the mid-island region of Vancouver Island, embracing the school districts of Cowichan (SD #65), Lake Cowichan (SD #66), Ladysmith (SD #67), and Nanaimo (SD #68), was commissioned by the British Columbia School Trustees Association on June 2, 1971. This consultant was supplied with terms of reference derived from previous similar studies in British Columbia. These terms of reference included an examination of the educational program, educational services, financial situation, and community involvement in education in the participating districts. However, in this particular case these terms of reference were modified by the fact that a previous study, recently completed by Mr. Roy Stibbs, had examined the educational program and educational services in the region. Thus the task of this consultant was noticeably eased, since it was possible to make use of Mr. Stibbs' report. The primary emphasis in this report is then, on the financial and community involvement aspects of reorganization.

The first part of the report examines the basic pattern of school district reorganizations in North America, attempting to find some common factors. The central concept developed is that of the two possible views of an educational system, the community view and the society view. This basic polarity seems to provide a perspective from which reorganization studies become comprehensible. The report continues by examining the concepts of local control and accountability, as they relate to the notion of community involvement in school districts. The final part of the first section deals with the relevance of the material developed for the present study.

The study then continues with some assessment of previously developed criteria for school district reorganization. There are three main sets which are used as an organizing principle for the remainder of the report. These are educational, financial, and community involvement criteria. The final section of the report deals with some possible reorganization plans for the region under study.

This field study relied primarily on documentary analysis and some fifty personal interviews for data. An attempt was made to identify the state of community opinion regarding amalgamation, in particular as this is reflected, interpreted and modified by school trustee opinion. Clearly, in the time available, a thorough analysis of opinion on such a complex topic was not possible. However, the consultant believes that the views expressed here as representative are indeed accurate.

The previous studies on amalgamation carried out in British Columbia and particularly those of Dr. Norman Robinson and Mr. F. Levirs, were extremely valuable in carring out this study. It is safe to say that it would have been impossible to complete this assignment in the four weeks allowed without the work done by these previous consultants. Their analyses and thoughtful comments on amalgamation gave substantial guidance to this writer. Additionally, the great assistance and kindly reception offered in all the participating school districts by trustees and board officials alike must be acknowledged. Finally, the assistance of the staff of the British Columbia School Trustees Association, particularly that of Mr. Walter Sawadsky in the economic and financial analyses, and of Mrs. Susan Walz in typing the report, must also be acknowledged with gratitude.

THE RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

In general, most studies of school district reorganization commence with the notion of school district adequacy. However, the writer of this study believes, with Dr. Norman Robinson, that it is important first to consider the underlying values which give rise to organizational structures. Robinson (1969) points out that three basic kinds of values have been commonly used in the past in examining school district organization. These are program values, financial values, and consumer values. The small, local districts developed in the nineteenth and early twentieth century in North America were clearly the result of an emphasis on consumer values. In effect, this is to say that organizational structures will vary through time as the needs and expectations of society or the educational system vary.

The first consideration in this report is then the interpretation of that change in values and expectations for education in society which leads to the requirement of school district reorganization. This will be considered within the framework of an analysis of a continuing tension between society and community, which has as one focus the issue of control of education.

Community and Society

The concept of community/society has been chosen as the organizing principle of this study because of its utility in explaining the changing structure of the educational system. The concept can be linked to a number of vital issues in educational discussion currently, and thus seems to act as an organizing principle in the light of which these issues can be more readily understood. For example, the issues of local control in education, accountability, the community school, and the larger issue of centralization and decentralization, are clearly all amenable to analysis in terms of the society/community polarity. Similarly, the most fundamental and lasting basic value in education in North America, that of equality of educational opportunity is also related to the society/community opposition.

The basic distinction between community and society used here is that proposed by Newmann and Oliver (1969), but is not, of course, original to these writers, but derived from the work of others.

> The former signifies a closely knit, generally self-sufficient rural group in which the extended family serves not only the function of procreation but also the functions of economic production, education, recreation, religion, care of the sick and aged, safety, and defence. Individuals in such a group know each other well; they share common experiences and traditions; they depend upon each other, and assume responsibility for solving group problems. Style of life varies inappreciably from one generation to the next.
>
> A sharp contrast to this type of group is mass society, characterized by large numbers of people within an urban industrial environment, influenced by many institutions each of which performs the separate functions of education, religion, economic production, defence, medicine, recreation, care of the aged, and legal and political control. People shift their places of residence, change their occupations and follow living styles quite different from those of previous generations. Because of mobility, specialization, and a rapid rate of change, pepple have less in common with each other, and weaker ties to a basic or primary group; their allegiances and loyalties are diffused among many social units instead of focused on one. (pp. 2,3)

The distinction made here then, is a critical one for an educational system, since it must adapt itself to the expectations of its clients. These may range on a continuum virtually anywhere from an extreme societal view to an extreme community view. The work of the school system is complicated by the fact that the professionals, that is, the administrators and school staffs, are typically outsiders to the community in which they work, and are seen as intruders in a small community, that is, in an educational

environment in which the clients tend towards community views rather than society views. This situation of the professional educator has been fully analyzed in Vidich and Bensman in Small Town in Mass Society, (1958) which, as the title suggests, concerns itself with precisely the topic of this discussion.

For the purposes of this study, the essential difference between society and community is in the differing expectations for education. The community views education as a socialization process which prepares the young person to take his place in the existing community, and occupy in it approximately the position of his parents. That is, he is considered a replacement for an existing adult member of the community. The education system, at least in its overall objectives to satisfy the community, must then satisfy this expectation.

The society, on the other hand, has expectations for the young which are far more global and open. The education system is expected to socialize the young again, but in this view the socialization process carried on in the education system has the primary purpose of providing useful skills and knowledge with which the young person can enter the open and competitive social system. The expectation is that the most successful graduates of the education system will achieve high status and relative prosperity as a consequence. They will pursue a career with the accompanying expectations of substantial geographical movement as well as social movement. The university is seen as the logical stepping stone to this movement. Thus the education system will be satisfactory to the extent that it prepares people for entry to the university or some other equivalent kind of career preparation, or allows them to find a job in the larger society.

The opposition between community and society purposes in school district organization makes itself felt in particular, when the question of school district size is considered. Clearly, if the school district sees itself as preparing young people for a life in society in general, then the range of programs, the range of educational services, and the range of social

contacts also, is an important determinant of school district adequacy. The simple rule -- the larger, the better. On the other hand, if a school district sees itself as preparing young people for a life in a community, then size is a disadvantage, and the small school district can more easily approximate community norms. Very frequently, the attempt is made to combine both possibilities. Thus the American Association of School Administrators (1958) suggests that:

> One of the major problems of school district reorganization is how to secure a school district that is large enough to be educationally adequate and economically efficient, yet small enough to retain a sense of community membership. (p. 130)

Dr. Robinson also addressed himself to the need to serve both purposes. He adds, as a further necessity however, that both purposes must be achieved in an "economically efficient manner".

> The task then for lay and professional groups in education is to develop organizational structures in education that meet the educational needs of a complex, urban society and at the same time protect and guarantee the desire of local citizens for close involvement in the affairs of their educational institutions. (p. 50)

It is clearly impossible to fully meet both sets of purposes. The transportation of students to a senior secondary school outside the boundaries of the local community which offers the full range of programs and educational services that a life in society requires them to have, almost certainly runs counter to community life and community values. In effect then, the regional high school becomes the educational expression of the notion of society. The notion of community may be limited to elementary schools, and possibly the junior secondary schools. If this is the case, then any attempt to preserve community participation in the educational system, to allow the expression of community values, will probably be focused on these educational institutions.

Local Control and Accountability

The fact that what has been described here as the dominance of the society view of education has produced something of a crisis for the ideology of local control has not escaped the attention of school trustees and others involved in education. The extreme society view of education would destroy the concept of local control completely. Lieberman (1960) for instance, would maintain that local control has outlived its usefullness and that it must give way to a centralized system of educational control. He bases this position on the mobility and interdependence of our society, on the fact that national survival requires educational policies not subject to local control, that local control cannot be reconciled with democracy, and that local control is the cause of "the dull parochialism and attenuated totalitarianism that characterizes public education". (p. 34)

There are, in essence, two ways of regarding the question of local control. One is as a political device for ensuring that the schools are democratically controlled in the final analysis. (The second is as a way of insuring liaisor between the schools and the community, and will be dealt with under the heading of "Accountability".) Clearly, the first of these remains a possibility, with the central government, province, or state, playing a somewhat larger role than the local government. It is not reasonable to argue that the central government is necessarily less alert to society's needs with regard to education than the local government, since historically the reverse has often been the case. (Lipset, 1970)

The general issue over which local control and state control of education has been disputed is the issue of equality of educational opportunity. The political structure of the local community has often been such that concern with equality of educational opportunity has been minimal.

> In local communities the political structure is most often dominated by the property-owning classes, including the social and business elite of the community... These men have three

> interests which together lead in the direction of a system of preferential or differentiated education. The first is a desire that their own children have maximum benefits from the educational system. The second is to keep property taxes, from which education is largely financed, low. Both these interests lead to the concentration of children in schools according to background -- through either concentration of residence or selection -- and to greated educational effort being expended on children from better backgrounds. A third interest, that of protecting the social order, or the structure of the community, from the disruption caused by high social mobility, is also held by consensus in such oligarchies, and reinforces pressure towards differential educational opportunity. (Coleman, 1970: p. 70)

Since national or provincial governments are responsive to pressures from a wider range of people, they have tended to become the proponents of equality of educational opportunity.

There is a further threat to the ideology of local control of quite a different type, which also derives from the current dominance of the society view of education. This is the large role currently provided for the expert, the professional educator, in the administration of the educational system. The argument runs that since the educational system must be responsive to the larger society, since curriculum decisions are taken at governmental levels by committees of experts, since the needs of the students can only be assessed in relationship to career expectations outside the local community, the professional educator must be the dominant force in decision-making. The extent to which educators have taken over policy-making in education has been documented often enough. The following perception is perhaps typical:

> Even in their own domain, policy-making, school boards often are not the final masters. As a visible and handy target,

> the superintendent himself is not likely to subvert or delay implementation of board policies, or, if this opposition is too blatant, the board has the ready remedy of its power of removal. Undercutting by the rest of the professional bureaucracy, however, is another matter. By inertia alone, or non-decision-making, they can thwart board intentions. In several studies of school integration in New York City, the failure of the bureaucracy to implement board policy has been shown as decisive in the final outcome. (Fantini et al, 1970: p. 68)

Thus the notion of local control is under attack in at least two major ways, of which the second may be the more important since it represents an outright commitment by the professionals to complete control of the educational system in a way that the policies of central governments usually do not.

> The major threat to local control at present, in Canada at least, is not a repudiation of the ideology or a lack of other pressures supporting local control, as a desirable strategy. It is rather a question, as local powers shift from primarily business matters to the broader sphere of educational policy formation, of whether the typical school board can rise to the new challenge. Many boards have such a limited understanding of how lay citizens can effectively use experts without either abdicating on the one hand or meddling on the other, that their capabilities in handling educational policy matters are dubious. (Andrews, 1970: p. 60)

This quotation suggests the need for a redefinition of responsibilities, and an examination of the appropriate way for school boards to use their "expert" advisors. This question, together with the question of accountability now to be discussed, will be examined from the point of view of criteria of effective school districts, in the next section of this report.

Accountability

It was pointed out previously that there are two ways of regarding the question of local control, the second of which deals with the relationship between the schools and the community. This is generally now described as "accountability". This concept, as it is currently being discussed in education, has at least two main elements: The first, cost-benefit analysis, is not relevant here. The second, the responsiveness of the schools to their clients, is an important element in this study, and is comprehensible in terms of the society/community polarity. As schools become more and more responsive to the society view, as determined by professional educators, they seem to become less and less responsive to the needs of their clients, and particularly parents.

It has already been argued that the first casualty of the complete victory of the society view of the school system would be the measure of local control of the educational system currently existing. Centralization of authority and planning would make this inevitable. The second casualty, and this is perhaps not quite so obvious, would be the relationship as it exists between the community, the school, and the family. This relationship, it has already been established, is one of the critical variables involved in student achievement. It is probable that the variable of support in the home for education and learning is more influential in student achievement than the variable of quality of teaching. The evidence for the importance of the atmosphere of the home has been recently reviewed by Cohen (1969). His primary reference is of course the Coleman report, but there is a good deal of additional evidence. Cohen summarizes the situation thus:

> There is abundant evidence that parents who are involved in a direct way in their children's education, tend to have children who achieve at higher levels. (p. 28)

Although local control in the sense of political representation may be achieved in fact at the school district level, it is still the case that

at the level of the local school, there is very little that the clients of the school, that is, the students and their parents, can achieve in terms of control or influence.

> At the level of the local school, the relevant public, the local public, is virtually disenfranchised. Within the neighbourhoods or attendance districts of the local school, there is, it seems, precious little that parents, citizens, and friends of youth may do to influence, effectively, the way their children are educated. More often than not, it seems the local concerned public can only appeal to the representatives of a larger and often unresponsive public to bring about change. And in the process, the efforts of the local public are deflected, diluted, and rendered inconsequential. (Green, 1968: p. 115)

This is to say, of course, that local control of education has meant control by society's representatives, rather than those of the immediate community. Certainly in the large school district, for instance, a city school district, it is unreasonable to expect trustees to be concerned with events at the local school, as school boards are presently consituted and presently operate. The case for community schools, and for small school districts often revolves around this notion that the important public is the clientele of the local school. Thus a major problem in school district reorganization, from the community involvement viewpoint, can be considered to be the provision of adequate links between the school and the family.

The move away from the small district, bounded by the natural community, towards the large district, embracing several communities, clearly threatens the relationship between the schools and the family. It should not be assumed that this relationship is today well established. A good many writers on the topic of accountability have adopted the view that this is a major weakness of the school system, and that the solution lies in a higher level of cooperation between citizens and educators. (Douglas, 1971;Briner, 1969: p. 205)

A review of some theoretical material on the topic of linking organizations and external primary groups will suggest some solutions. Litwak and Mayer (1967) address themselves particularly to the problem of the relations between schools and families. After reviewing the evidence on educational achievement, they point out that:

> It is important to recognize that some schools are seeking closer contact with families precisely because they want to increase the efficiency of education. Furthermore, if we observe practictioners in other institutional areas -- such as business, the army, fund-raising, control of delinquency -- we find their procedures reflecting the theory of linkage that closely parallels the "open door policy" of the educator. Moreover, sociologists who are working very closely with practitioners, as in studies of voting and consumer behaviour, have reached a similar conclusion, although they usually do not generalize its implications for linkage theory. (p. 527)

These writers identify two kinds of educator attitude towards the families of the children for whom he is responsible. They characterize these as the "locked door policy" and the "open door policy". The latter "holds that maximum education will occur where the families and schools are brought closer together". (p.527)

The careful analysis of the characteristics of primary groups and bureaucratic organizations by Litwak and Mayer suggests that the structures of the two are incompatible and antithetical, and there is a good case to be made for separating these structures. Thus we are left with the paradox that to achieve its purposes fully and maximize student achievement, the school must involve the family, and yet close involvement between schools and families must necessarily generate hostility. The analysis by Litwak and Mayer suggests that the key element which renders two structures incompatible is the use of the "expert":

> The structure of the bureaucratic organization serves to support and encourage the trained expert, whereas the primary

> group tends to do the opposite...The optimal solution is therefore some mid-point where limiting effects are minimized and complementary contributions of both organizational forms are maximized. (p. 532)

The kind of linking structure desirable here then will inevitably confront problems similar to those described above as critical for local control in education, that is, the problem of how to make maximum use of the expert while at the same time retaining the contribution of the layman. Thus it can be maintained that in terms of local control and of accountability, there is only one key issue at present in the administration of school districts and that is the relations between laymen and experts. It would seem then, that a suitable linking mechanism between the community and the school system could serve to alleviate both problems, and have the desirable effects of improving the responsiveness of the schools to local control in the fullest sense, and at the same time involving the families in the work of the schools to the ultimate benefit of the students.

The linking mechanisms suggested by Litwak and Mayer which stress two-way flow of information are the "opinion leader notion", that is, locating opinion leaders in the community and using them to communicate important information to the community; the "voluntary association", like the school auxiliary, or the parent-teacher association; and the "common messenger" notion which takes advantage of dual membership, primarily the child's, in both structures. This can also be seen as one useful subordinate advantage of the use of volunteer aides in the schools; the volunteer aide, when a parent, in particular, serves this common messenger function, since he or she has dual membership. The most desirable type of linking mechanism would presumably involve all three of the proposals, and the community education committee, which has been proposed fairly frequently in recent years, is perhaps useful for this reason. (See Appendix A for a local instance.)

One of the assumptions made by proponents of such committees in the past has been that principals of schools will be the leaders of such committees. Thus, Goldhammer (1968) suggests that:

> One of the key functions of the leadership role of the principal of the individual attendance unit may be to work with a neighbourhood advisory council to obtain the perspectives of parents and key citizens relative to educational plans and developments. At the same time, he should be in a position to keep them informed of educational needs and to help them understand the vital roles which schools play in the life of the community. (p. 127)

Other writers also have assumed that the key person in the community education committee will be the principal of the school. (See, for instance, Blumenburg, 1971) However, this writer sees very substantial advantages in having school trustees serve this important function. First, the traditional role of the school trustee is basically concerned with the liaison between the schools and the communities. Secondly, school trustees have been elected as representatives of the community, and thus it is most appropriate for them to chair committees of the representatives of the community. This is not inconsistent with the position taken by school administrators in the past. For instance, the American Association of School Administrators has stated that one major responsibility of school boards is:

> keeping parents and other citizens informed of the school program and giving careful consideration to public opinion expressed at appropriate meetings and through other proper channels. (p. 106)

Probably most trustees would agree that the decision-making function of the school board is tied very closely to the representative function of school trustees. Thus they administer the schools only by virtue of representing community opinion. A BCSTA staff paper states the case for this representative function, in the context of trustee training programs:

> The representative function of the school trustee is

paramount. Administration can be more effectively performed by suitably qualified staff hired for the purpose and the role of legitimizer of the provincial government's fiscal policies is not very noble or useful. Unless the representative function is adequately performed it is very difficult to justify the existence of school boards.

The representative function of the school board is based on two assumptions: firstly that the trustee has an adequate understanding of his community, and secondly, that he has an adequate understanding of the educational program operating in the district and has at his disposal a means of communication which will permit him to convey information in both directions. This is the role for which the new trustee is to be prepared by any training program. (Gray, 1971: p. 2)

Thus, one major advantage of having school trustees chair community education committees is that it gives them access to the current opinions of people in the community about the education system. This seems likely to be more effective and more reliable than the attempts made by trustees in the past to keep abreast of community opinions by attendance at meetings of various groups, and so on.

Perhaps more important than this though, is the very important function which such committees could play in focusing the question of lay control. If these committees were comprised of community representatives and the principals of the schools serving the area for which the committee is responsible, perhaps focused on a junior secondary school, then these committees would be the setting for a continuing and critical debate on lay control and professional autonomy. The trustee chairman would then be in a position of arbitrating, interpreting, and perhaps proposing the formalization of the notion of lay control. School principals on the other hand, would have immediate response to their policy suggestions which would leave them in very little doubt in most cases as to the boundary lines for that

particular community between lay and professional control. At present, principals are often handicapped in their policy decisions by being unsure as to what is within their domain and what is not. The school board as a relatively remote entity, does not often help them in arriving at an appropriate interpretation.

This does of course, suggest a new role for trustees, a role which is certainly within their jurisdiction. It is in fact surprising that trustees have made relatively little attempt to enlist the support of parents in particular, in asserting the public's right to make policy decisions. The current loss of power by the parent-teacher associations in British Columbia is perhaps both evidence of, and a result of, the breakdown of what seems on the surfact to be a likely alliance. This breakdown has certainly contributed to the current virtual autonomy of the professional in educational decision-making.

The concept of the community education committee is linked with other notions of community control in education. One of the most recent attempts at educational reform in the United States is the concept of the community school, and this emphasizes the role of the community, and particularly the parents:

> The most advanced concept of the community school... features a fundamental change in the role of the community. Now, the community participates not only as a client, not only in an advisory role, but also as a decision-maker. It joins with professionals in planning and operating the school. The clients no longer accept, on faith, the idea that the school serves the community; they take an active hand in determining the nature of the school's services and in ensuring that it is continually responsible to their needs as they see and feel them. (Fantini et al, 1970: p. 82)

It has already been pointed out that community education committees could serve two kinds of purposes, those involved in the notion of local control

(political purposes) and those involved in the notion of accountability (educational purposes). They serve both kinds of purposes because they focus on the same issue, the relation between laymen and professional educators. It is not appropriate to think of these committees as in any way threatening to educators. Their effects should be beneficial to both parties; the educator who adopts the open door policy can only benefit from it in the long run.

The issues of local control and accountability can be seen to focus at the present time on the success of some social invention like the community education committee. It seems that in a large school district responsive primarily to the society view of education, it is only in this way that the benefits of local control can survive. These benefits have been summarized by Campbell et al:

> Citizens value local control because it does permit some local discussion; it does permit the local district to be responsive to local needs; it does allow local districts to exceed minimum standards established by the state; it does allow for the participation of large numbers of citizens in the consideration of the objectives and directions for local schools. (1965: p. 85)

Assessment and Implications

The foregoing analysis of the political, and educational background to the continuing studies of school district reorganizations will, it is hoped, provide an appropriate context for the remainder of this study. Clearly, this study of a particular region and the possibilities for reorganization of school districts within that region is not in any sense an isolated and separate endeavour. It is, in fact, the most recent in a long series of such studies, virtually all of which have tended towards consolidation of school districts into larger and larger units. To refer to the concepts already established, the society view of educational organization and of the control of education has won a long

series of victories, and has dominated school district reorganizations completely. This does not of course necessarily demonstrate the superiority of the society view of educational organization. It merely suggests that this view has been more popular in recent years than the alternative view of the educational organization as an arm of the community.

Thus it should not necessarily be presumed that because larger districts seem to answer more satisfactorily the present needs of society for educational organizations, that they are presently inevitable. It is presumably still the case that some local political choice remains. In such cases, the community view of education can presumably hold its own against the society view, and a small school district, satisfactory to the community which it serves, can continue to exist almost indefinitely. However, it is unlikely that a small school district can survive unless it has extremely strong local support, that is, unless it exists in and serves a community with a very clear and widely shared view of its own identity.

The primary application of this material to the current study lies then in the determination of the wishes of school trustees and the citizens whom they represent. If these wishes are clearly in favour of the society view, that is, of a school system which prepares students for the world at large, and provides an educational program and educational facilities good enough to equip young men and women for a competitive mass society, then clearly the largest administrative unit possible will be the most satisfactory solution to the problem of school district organization. If on the other hand, the community wishes to retain a high level of community integration, and is prepared to sacrifice some measure of educational quality for that end, then that choice too is still open.

This is effectively a re-assertion of the position adopted by Robinson regarding the development of school district structures as being a mix

of program, financial, and consumer values. He traces the history of school district reorganizations in British Columbia as being an assertion of the importance of program and financial values. Thus he says, for instance:

> The recommendations of Cameron were designed to place more emphasis on program and financial values in the design of adequate school district units. (p. 10)

The purpose of the first part of this study has been to attempt to analyze more carefully the significance of the choices offered by Cameron, which are in effect the choices still offered by amalgamation and consolidation into large school districts. The view here is that trustees and citizens should understand clearly the significance of the choice, and the basis on which it must be made, if the decision is to be an appropriate one for their community.

One final point can be made regarding the choice between an educational system responsive to society's needs and expectations, and an educational system responsive to the needs and wishes of the community. It is possible to maintain that our schools have become too responsive to the society view. Many of the current issues discussed in educational journalism support this interpretation. Concerns such as the community schools, citizen advisory committees, voucher situations for education, and accountability, all have the common denominator of attempting to involve members of the community in and with the education system, and thus all have reference to the community view, as opposed to the society view, of education. Since neither view is necessarily good or necessarily bad, but either view has broad implications for the future of students, for decisions on curriculum, and for the community in which the school system exists, the appropriate policy at this time seems to be to make such choices knowingly, and perhaps to attempt to redress possible imbalance between the society and community view. Thus, wherever possible, the community view of the school ought to be supported, since it may in the near future become a

more acceptable view of the educational system than it has been in the recent past. This forecast may be more optimistic than realistic. Green, (1969) would agree:

> All things considered, then, if we ask what, in a surprise-free projection, we might reasonably expect to be the predominant values shaping the functions of the schools, then our answer will have to be those aggregate values of the great society rather than the distributive values of the good community. The schools will probably continue to function to provide the human resources for the economic and military institutions of our society. They will probably continue to be viewed as the productive institutions they are, and the values that govern will be those appropriate to such a productive enterprise. (p. 132-133)

In view of this probably dismal prospect for the community view of the school, it might be claimed that the advice given above, that the community school ought to be supported where possible, is probably bad. Against this, it can be argued that decisions on reorganization and amalgamation are at best only temporary decisions. If, in fact, the decision arrived at by school trustees in the mid-island region considering amalgamation at the present time is not satisfactory to the clients and the community as a whole, the issue will certainly arise again in the near future. Thus, if a school district should decide at this point not to amalgamate, then if there are genuine reasons for amalgamation, the pressure to reconsider the question will be great. Thus a school district asserting the need to retain a community view of the schools will, in the long run, if the view of Green quoted above is correct, have to reconsider that decision.

To summarize the discussion to this point: the choice of amalgamation or consolidation into a large district, or the retention of the small existing district, can be made on the basis of program values, that is, the quality and scope of the educational program offered, financial values, that is, the costs of providing that program, or consumer

values, that is, the concern for local control and accountability which may be more easily attained in the small district. More accurately, the decision can be taken on the basis of any combination of these values. Certainly debate on amalgamation ought to consider all of these. The key point raised here with regard to consumer values has been to point out that this element is perhaps the most important. What we know now about the effects of the local community on the schools and on the students would suggest that the achievement and motivation of students, and thus the general level of effectiveness of the schools, is extremely susceptible to influence from the clients, in this case the parents and the community as a whole. Thus, it is inappropriate at this stage in our knowledge of education to attempt to make decisions about educational systems which do not pay a good deal of attention to the element of consumer values or the involvement of the community in the schools.

However, it should be kept in mind that the adoption or retention of the community view of the school system carries with it substantial disadvantages. The broad educational program, characteristic of a society view of secondary education as preparing students for extensive further training and job mobility, will probably suffer. Certainly, the community view involves extensive costs, since the small school district is almost certainly more expensive to operate. Finally, even in the area of community involvement, there is some doubt as to whether small school districts do in fact achieve a higher level of parental participation in the education system. There is no doubt that most people in communities, and including trustees, feel that small districts are likely to involve citizens more in the schools. But there is little evidence that this is, in fact, the case. Thus the small district, wishing to retain its community view of education, does so at substantial cost.

SOME CRITERIA FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

The main motivation in school district reorganizations, it has been suggested, is the drive to keep educational structures in step with demands on the educational system.

> In an era of ever-accelerating change, the educational needs of people affected by these changes are undergoing rapid modification and adjustment. The organization of school districts during the past two decades has been unable to provide the programs and services consistent with the emergent needs of our society. As a result, the educational structure is undergoing critical analysis and evaluation by legislators, business and industrial leaders, and by the progessional educators. (Purdy, 1968: p. 3)

The general technique is to establish a set of criteria which are regarded as fundamental to the good school district, to review the status of existing school districts in the light of these criteria, and to make recommendations for change which would bring them more nearly into line with the criteria. This approach has been adopted in, for instance, a study by Briner et al (1960) of School District Organization in St. Louis County, Missouri; C.O. Fitzwater (1957), in a general study of school district reorganization for the U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare; by the American Association of School Administrators (1958), in a report entitled School District Organization; in the California State Department of Education Manual for the Study of School District Reorganization by County Committees (1962); and more recently in British Columbia by Dr. Norman Robinson in Reorganization of British Columbia School Districts: The Armstrong Case (1969), and Mr. F. Levirs' East Kootenay Amalgamation Feasibility Study (1971).

An examination of the amalgamation criteria proposed in these studies reveals quite noticeable similarities. A set of criteria contained in

the manual published by the California State Department of Education is probably characteristic of the whole group:

> The State Board of Education has adopted four specific objectives in the program of developing school district reorganization:
>
> 1. To produce a more effectively coordinated program of education for all levels of the state's public school system through strong local school district organization, with single administrative control over all levels of public education in a given area.
>
> 2. To provide a more efficient use of public funds, brought about by the creation of school districts capable of furnishing necessary educational services at a reasonable unit cost.
>
> 3. To provide a better and more equalized educational opportunity for all children in the state through the creation of school districts sufficient in size to be able to provide curricular offerings and other services not possible under existing organizations.
>
> 4. To effect as great a degree of equalization of financial resources on the local level as circumstances will permit. (p. 1)

It has already been suggested that in British Columbia the criteria for school district reorganization have not substantially differed from these. The Cameron Report (1945) proposed that school districts employing about one hundred teachers would approach the ideal, and this suggests the extent to which the criteria have changed, since few people would now consider a school district employing one hundred teachers as ideal. In fact, recent reorganization studies by Robinson and by Levirs suggest optimal enrolments of about 15,000 students, which would presumably work out to about 700 teachers employed. Robinson, in fact, recommends

that school districts with less than 15,000 pupils should compensate for their low enrolments by creating regional school districts which would enable them to build up enrolments to the point at which districts were able to provide a full range of services. (p. 14) A more detailed assessment of criteria for an adequate school district, as these relate to the districts participating in this study, can be provided under the headings already proposed: educational criteria, financial criteria, and community involvement criteria.

Educational Criteria

The educational criteria relevant to the mid-island region reorganization study have already been developed in the Stibbs' Report. What remains to be done in this report is simply to point out the generality of such criteria. Previous investigations of school district reorganization in North America have generally adopted the society view of the educational system, and have consequently argued for the advantages of large school districts. The variable of size has been compared with student achievement, student socialization, student social competence, efficient use of teaching staff, the availability of programs, and other variables. The following material reviews some of the findings on these topics.

There is no question that the basic criterion for an adequate school district at the present time is a large pupil enrolment, which justifies and utilizes an extensive range of educational services. In discussing quality in education, for instance, Schwartz (1968) points out that amongst the elements necessary for quality education are:

> 1. Educational programs designed to maximize the educational attainments of all the people in the community.
> 2. Specialized personnel and instructional services available for all students.
> 3. Supporting services and personnel available.
> 4. Community support and understanding readily evident.
>
> (pp. 20-21)

Another writer examining the effects of a reorganization on secondary education showed that a merger of five small high schools resulted in:

1. A greatly broadened curriculum could be offered.
2. The increase in enrolment per section reduced the number of sections.
3. Teachers taught in their field of specialization.
4. Greater success was experienced in employing highly qualified teachers.

(Stone, 1968: p. 51)

The same writer summarized research studies on secondary school size and pointed out that the optimum size for a secondary school is between 700 and 900 students.

Another analysis of the effects of school size on educational factors suggests the following characteristics:

1. The smaller the school, the greater the chance that the teacher will teach in two or more subject areas.
2. The smaller the school, the greater the number of subject preparations.
3. Schools with larger enrolments tend to attract teachers with better preparation.
4. Teachers in large districts meet more pupils daily.

(Maxey and Thomas, 1968: p. 57)

There is also some evidence that large schools produce students who score well on tests of social competence (Goldenstein, 1968: p. 65), and that students in larger secondary schools scored higher on achievement tests. The conclusion of this particular study suggests that the larger the school, the better the test scores of students:

> Both the boys and the girls attending the larger high schools obtain ... standard scores which were directly proportional to the size of the high school in which they were enrolled. (Poling, 1968: p. 204)

There is a fair range of evidence, then, that larger school districts are capable of providing better education.

It is certainly true that when the present British Columbia secondary school curriculum is considered, the larger school district has a distinct advantage in the range of programs it is able to offer. The Stibbs report analyzes the program offerings in the districts under consideration, and shows a direct relationship between district size and programs offered. Even when districts make a distinct effort to provide programs, regardless of cost, they are still not able to match the program provision of the larger districts. It might be assumed that the inability to provide a wide range of programs would be reflected in student retention rates in school districts, but an analysis of retention to grade 12 over the last five years does not show any obvious relationship of this type in the districts under study.

Several of the comments just reviewed refer to characteristics of large districts which affect teachers and their work. It is probably the case that teachers prefer to work in larger districts, although there is only limited data on this in any of the sources consulted. It is certainly generally felt to be the case that teachers perceive large districts as providing better opportunities for promotion, and for teaching in the area of specialization, than small districts.

Some data recently collected in British Columbia suggests that there is indeed a movement of teachers in the province from small districts to large districts. The motivation for the move is not very clear, and is at least tentatively identified with the tendency of larger districts to be located in the metropolitan area, and thus to have the attractions of metropolitan life. However, it is certainly true that larger districts seem to have attractions which go beyond the non-educational ones, since Prince George, for instance, seems to have no great difficulty in attracting teaching staff even though its salary scales are not noticeably high.

(In 1970 Prince George ranked 75th in salaries for elementary teachers, and 61st in salaries for secondary teachers.) There is, however, not sufficient data to be certain of any relationship between teacher recruitment and size of district in British Columbia; at best, one could maintain that some positive relationship probably exists between size of district and qualifications of staff.

However, in general the educational criteria do suggest the superiority of large school districts when the society view of education is adopted, that is, when education is viewed as preparing students for social and geographical mobility, entrance to university, and so on.

Financial Criteria

There are two main types of criteria for the financial adequacy of school districts. The first type, referred to above in quoting other reorganization and consolidation studies, is that of the adequacy of the tax base to support an educational program. In British Columbia, the basic program approach to financing education reduces the importance of this criterion, because of the grant from the Department of Education for the approved Basic Education Program. The assessed value per student figure, frequently used in considering the financial situation of school districts is, in British Columbia, only important to the extent that it determines the ability of the school district to raise money beyond the approved budget for the Basic Education Program. For most school districts, this potential amounts to only 10% of the total operating budget. In the case of the few school districts which must seek approval to permit budget overages, the assessed value per student is still quite a significant figure, since with a high assessed value per student, a district needs a relatively low mill rate for its budget overage.

There is, however, an extremely important financial criterion of school district operation which does apply in British Columbia. This is the cost per student per year. In 1970 this ranged by district from a high of $1,024 to a low of $571. The table which follows demonstrates that this range is not in fact a random one.

TABLE I. COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL STATISTICS FOR ALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN B.C. WITH ENROLMENT OF 10,000+ AND 2,500-.

	SD's Over 10,000 Pupils*	SD's Under 2,500 Pupils**	SD65	SD66	SD67	SD68
Average of gross Operating Costs Per Student	$619	$739	$649	$796	$758	$627
Percentage of Budget on Admin.	4.61	7.12	4.7	8.1	5.7	5.6
Percentage of Budget on Maint.	5.51	6.51	5.6	5.9	8.7	5.5
Pupil/Teacher Ratios	23.16	21.03	21.26	20.15	20.43	21.33

* Districts over 10,000 pupils - 11 districts

** Districts under 2,500 pupils - 36 districts

Large districts appear to have distinct financial advantages over small ones. Although the range between the average cost per student in small districts and the average cost per student in large districts is nothing like as extreme as the overall range in the 1970 budget figures. It is nevertheless large enough to provide a clear indication of superior efficiency for the large district.

It should be pointed out that there is no evidence whatsoever of a relationship between expenditures on education and student achievement, (this was one of the major findings of the Coleman Report, 1966), and thus there is no justification for believing the educational program provided in the large districts is inferior to that provided in the small districts at a much higher cost. In fact the evidence already discussed suggests that the reverse is the case, that in fact, large school districts provide a better range of programs and even possibly better student achievement, than small districts.

The 1970 budget figures given for the districts participating in the study suggest that they are in fact not diverging very sharply from the averages for their size of district. Cowichan School District, as a medium-sized district, is not covered in this analysis, but one would assume that its financial performance, falling as it does between that of the average for large districts, and the average for small districts, is not unusual.

There are, of course, a number of ways of accounting for these differences in costs between large and small districts. The fact that the percentages of the budgets spent on maintenance and administration seem to vary with size of district is presumably a reflection of the superior efficiency of the large district in providing specialized personnel for maintenance operations, of having a large enough body of work to keep a regular staff completely busy for the full year, and perhaps of having adequate supervision. Similarly, the lower percentage costs for administration in large districts probably reflects the use of specialists who are more highly trained and thus more efficient in their roles, and the fuller opportunity to use specially trained personnel in a big district. Note that the relatively smaller percentage spent on administration and maintenance allows a large district to spend more on instruction, presumably a benefit.

The overall variation in operating costs per student between large and small districts is of course largely accounted for in differences in instructional costs. There are several ways of accounting for this difference, other than the obvious one of improved efficiency from large scale operation. It is powsible to maintain that, for example, School District #61 (Victoria) has a low per pupil cost because it is an attractive place to live and can recruit adequate numbers of teachers with a relatively low salary scale. However, it is in fact the case that Victoria School District in 1970 ranked 19th from the top (highest salaries) in elementary, and 24th in secondary salary scales. Despite this, the district manages to keep its cost per pupil down to $613, well below the provincial average.

It is the opinion of this consultant that there are few alternative explanations for the difference in costs between large and small school districts which explain the fact as satisfactorily as the view that large districts achieve substantial economies of scale in their educational operations.

Community Involvement Criteria

There are several dimensions of community involvement which could be established as criteria for estimating school district adequacy. It has already been pointed out for instance, that the involvement of parents with an interest in the education of their children, is considered an important variable in student achievement. The section on accountability is used as stated to support the view that school districts of any size must make provision for the active involvement of parents. Additionally, most people would consider that the extent of community involvement in the political aspects of the school district is a useful criterion. The tendency for seats on the school board to be contested, and for voters to vote in the contest, and voting on referenda, and the passage of referenda, are likely to be significant. A final criterion which should also be considered is what might be called local pride, or community integration. This is particularly important in the mid-island area.

The first of these criteria, that of the involvement of parents in the education of their children, is not apparently related to school district size. Cohen (1969) summarizing the situation, points out that the only known relationship here is between socio-economic status and involvement; parents of high status are distinctly more likely to be involved in the education of their children than parents of low status. Thus it is unlikely that any change in size of school district would have a significant effect on parental involvement. However, it is possible to maintain that very few school districts in fact have developed a satisfactory relationship between schools and parents. The community education committees already described are perhaps the best way of developing this linkage between schools and families, and the districts being considered here could probably benefit from the work of these committees.

The political criteria of community involvement with their school district are perhaps best viewed in terms of referendum votes. Clearly this is not enough in itself to demonstrate a high level of community involvement, but if referenda are defeated frequently this is probably a demonstration of some breakdown in the relationship between citizens and schools. The following table indicates the referendum history, over the last five years, of the school districts participating in this study.

TABLE II. REFERENDUM HISTORY OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY, JANUARY 1, 1966, TO PRESENT

SD #	Date of Referendum	Type of Referendum (Capital/Operating)	Approved (Yes/No)	Vote in Favour (%)
65	Dec. 12, 1966	Capital	Yes	67.6
	Mar. 29, 1969	Operating	No	36.3
	Apr. 18, 1970	Capital	No	55.6
	Dec. 17, 1970	Capital	No	55.7
	May 29, 1971	Capital	Yes	65.6
66	Jan. 28, 1967	Capital	Yes	77.8
	Jan. 28, 1967	Capital	Yes	76.7
67	May 28, 1966	Capital	Yes	79.5
	June 1, 1968	Capital	Yes	81.7
68	Dec. 9, 1967	Capital	Yes	65.9
	Mar. 12, 1970	Operating	No	46.1

The small districts have a somewhat better voting record than the large districts, which would tend to support the view that at the political level, community involvement in small districts is superior to that in large districts. It may be the case that voters in small districts feel that they have a closer relationship with their district and thus respond accordingly on referendum votes. However, the data here is too limited for any conclusion to be drawn.

The final criterion for community involvement, called here community integration or community pride, is not very frequently discussed in the literature, probably because it is clearly of only local relevance. The strength of this feeling in the region being considered, and particularly in School District #67, can be gauged from the fact that it was this concern, and this alone, which led to the development of two secondary schools in School District #67, rather than a single strong secondary school. Undoubtedly, from an educational and financial point of view, this decision was mistaken. However, from the point of view of community involvement and the satisfaction of the community, it was probably a correct decision. Such issues are always difficult to resolve, and illustrate the extent to which it is possible for the values discussed earlier, program values, financial values and consumer values, to be in opposition.

This aspect of community involvement is clearly a very important one in the region under consideration. Any amalgamation or reorganization proposal which ignores the concern of citizens in the region and particularly in the region presently identified as Ladysmith School District, would be a highly unsatisfactory one from this point of view.

****

This review of the criteria generally used in school district reorganization studies has suggested a number of measures of school district adequacy. Perhaps most important, it should be noted that there is not necessarily a built-in consistency between these. As was demonstrated in the final section, with regard to the location of high schools, it is quite likely that the basic values which underly school district organization will be in conflict in many of the decision situations facing school boards. As has already been pointed out with regard to reorganization studies in general, the tendency for a considerable period of time has been to lower the impact and importance of community values, or consumer values, in favour of program and financial valuess. It may be that this tendency is about to change, and that we will in the near future see a re-emphasis on community values. Thus an emphasis on community involvement criteria in any proposal for school district reorganization at the present time would be highly desirable.

AN EXAMINATION OF TWO POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

Two possible reorganization alternatives are presented and discussed in this section. Neither of these includes the district of Lake Cowichan, and before discussing the alternatives, it is perhaps necessary to explain why this is the case.

This district is to some extent geographically separated from the other districts participating in the study. The other three districts are on the same main highway, from Nanaimo to Victoria, which is effectively the key transportation link on Vancouver Island. Lake Cowichan, on the other hand, is some twenty-five miles east of this highway, and the road which links it to Duncan and the highway is not uniformly good. Thus there is some justification for the sense of isolation communicated by members of this community.

There is no question that the educational program of the school district, particularly at the senior secondary level, leaves something to be desired, although as the Stibbs report suggests, this very small school district has made a great effort to provide a strong educational program. This has lead to rather inefficient use of resources. In the secondary school in

Lake Cowichan, there are twenty-seven classes with fewer than fifteen pupils. This is probably the main reason for the noticeably high level of per pupil expenditures, $796 in 1970, as compared to the provincial average of $615.

Additionally, Lake Cowichan has only been able to offer educational services other than normal instruction by sharing specialists with School District #67. It is probable that this arrangement, which is mutually satisfactory at present, would no longer be possible if School District #67 were to amalgamate with some other district or districts. Thus the services of the special counsellor, elementary supervisor, and psychometrist would probably be lost to School District #66. It is of course possible that some other sharing arrangement could be made, although the relative isolation of this school district would make it difficult.

The great strength of the school district, educationally, is the degree of community involvement. This was pointed out in interview after interview and would, in the opinion of the consultant, be confirmed by any extensive survey of opinion in the district. The importance of community involvement for education programs has already been pointed out, and although there is no specific evidence of achievement (comparative evidence of scholastic achievement between districts is not released by the Department) one would suspect that students of this district perform rather better than small district students would normally be expected to do in the light of evidence regarding student achievement and its relation to small school districts already reviewed.

From a financial point of view, the information already presented suggests the problems encountered in this school district. Although expenditures are high, the educational program is still not comparable to that offered in bigger school districts. There is no prospect in the immediate future of any financial improvement in the situation of the school district, and in fact it is possible that assessed values will fall, thus making it more difficult for the district to raise funds locally. Clearly, this district could not operate without either the current level of budget overage, or some comparable level. The trustees are well aware of the need for economy

of operation, but at the same time they point out that they have received strong community support in the past. Thus they anticipate being able to achieve support for an operating referendum if it becomes necessary.

Perhaps the most obvious instance of community involvement with the schools, and community support for the program of the school board, is found in this school district. When amalgamation in this region was first discussed, school board held meetings with citizens throughout the district, and discussed with these citizens their views on amalgamation. The trustees interviewed report almost complete support for their stand opposing amalgamation and asserting the possibility of continued independent operation. There is little doubt that this school district represents a strongly held community view of the education system in which community values clearly outweigh society values with regard to the educational system. The citizens here seem prepared to sacrifice program values, and financial values, in order to retain what they see as a satisfactory level of school program closely responsive to the needs of the community. They fear that amalgamation into a larger district would rob them of their close contact with the school district operation; this might or might not happen in fact, but the feeling of the members of the community seems quite clear.

Thus Lake Cowichan can be viewed as one of the "small but necessary" school districts identified hypothetically by Dr. Robinson (p. 12). These are districts which do not have 2,500 pupils and "cannot be enlarged to include this number of pupils without serious violation of other criteria of school district adequacy". The difficulties likely to be faced by this school district have already been discussed to some extent. It could be noticeably alleviated by some arrangement with a neighbouring school district to provide secondary school programs at reasonable cost to students of Lake Cowichan District who require subjects not available in their own secondary school, and are prepared to undertake the bus travel which would become necessary. Further, some arrangement for joint use of services, like the one currently in effect with School District #67 would also be essential. Given at least these two special arrangements, Lake Cowichan could remain an independent district for the immediate future. However, it is conceivable

that the current level of support for the existing district could fall in future, and that the desirability of the society view of the educational system would begin to be felt by the local community. They would seek educational opportunities for their children which could not readily be satisfied in the small district. If this were to happen, obviously this school district would have to seek amalgamation with an adjacent district. Hypothetically, if an amalgamation of some neighbouring districts had already taken place, then Lake Cowichan might decide to seek an amalgamation with a bigger and as yet non-existent neighbouring district.

One Large District

This alternative would certainly meet very adequately the criteria for size of district discussed earlier. It should be pointed out that all the figures used in this discussion of the hypothetical school district, which will be called school district "A" in this discussion, are 1970 figures. No attempt has been made to project figures into the future, since this introduces an element of speculation which is undesirable at this point. Thus the enrolment figures for School District "A" would be the total of enrolments in the three districts which would be the constituent parts of the new district, that is, School District #65 (Cowichan), School District #67 (Ladysmith), and School District #68 (Nanaimo). School District "A" would have an enrolment then of 18,376, which would make it an entirely adequate school district from the point of view of size.

The implications of having a school district of this size need to be spelled out in some detail. The following treatment will deal with these from an educational, financial, and community involvement viewpoints.

From the educational viewpoint, clearly such a large school district could offer a very wide range of programs, and of educational services of all kinds. It could certainly afford to hire specialist teachers of a kind presently only employed in the large school districts in the province. The district would rival many of the eleven largest districts in the province in its potential for the provision of educational services.

The immediate impact on the educational program can be considered under two main headings, the provision of services beyond regular instructional services,

and the provision a wide range of secondary school programs. The first of these can be perhaps best referred back to he comparisons in the Stibbs report on the provision of education services in the existing districts. There is a noticeable discrepancy between the large and the small districts in provision of specialists' services, and clearly school district "A" proposed here would be able to meet the standards set in this area by the present large district, Nanaimo. With regard to secondary school offerings, something similar might well be said. But there is an additional and very important point about secondary school offerings that should certainly be made. It has already been pointed out that secondary schools act as a focus for community concern with schools. It is clear from the interview material collected by the consultant that any tendency for School District "A" to regard all the secondary schools within the district as solely the components of the large educational system would be a serious error. Instead, these schools should be regarded in two somewhat different ways, in the view of this consultant. Clearly, they are at present satisfying the needs of the communities in which they exist to some extent. In fact, the interview material suggests that these schools are offering services which are highly satisfactory to the communities in which they exist. Additionally, in the hypothetical School District "A", they must also be considered part of the total educational system.

The necessity to meet dual criteria can perhaps best be met by having these schools offer specialized programs. It would be possible for all of the senior secondary schools in the new district, of which there would be four, to offer a standard academic-technical program. Additionally, however, all of these schools might offer some portion of the full range of specialties and options sketched out in senior secondary school curriculum guides. The larger senior secondary schools will clearly offer more extensive programs than the smaller ones, but the limited size of the offerings of the smaller schools might well be balanced by excellence achieved through specialization.

One implication of this suggestion is clearly that all of these schools should be open boundary schools, and attendance at all of them should be open to any senior secondary student in the district. This would have serious implications for transportation, if many students decided to travel long distances, but

this seems unlikely and could be guarded against by reguiring students to give good reason for attending a distant school. The advantage of the system would be that students would not have to travel to take the standard academic program or some non-academic programs but if these were not satisfactory to them, these students would have options open which are not currently open to many students in the area. Thus, for instance, students in Ladysmith who desire programs not offered at the Ladysmith Secondary School would be able to travel to Nanaimo. Their presence in the Nanaimo school in programs which are at present not full would enable the Nanaimo Senior Secondary School to operate more economically. Similarly, Chemainus students who wished to take programs and specialties not available at the Chemainus Secondary School might choose to travel to Duncan to take these programs and courses at the Duncan Senior Secondary School, again with the effect of filling up classes which presently operate at rather low levels of enrolment, and thus again allowing the Duncan Senior Secondary School to operate more economically.

Clearly this redeployment of students would have the effect of providing a wider range of programs to the students in the districts under consideration, at the option of the students. It would also allow the provision of rather superior programs through specialization. Beyond this, a new school district, "A" would also be able to provide a full range of special services. Clearly, the district would be able to provide excellent resource centre and library services, as well as services at present marginal, for instance, ETV, which was deleted from Nanaimo's budget recently. A full staff of specialist teachers could also be made available to students, and the provision of these services could be done economically.

Financially, the situation of the proposed school district is illustrated in the following table. Had it existed in 1970, its budget would have been something like that shown in the table. Perhaps the most significant feature of the table is the close parallel which exists between the mill rates for district "A", and those for existing districts. This applies both to operating and debt and capital mill rates. This would suggest that there are close financial parallels between the districts which it is proposed would constitute School District "A", sufficient that the financial consequences of amalgamation would be minimal when viewed on this basis.

It has already been pointed out, however, that the financial statistics presented here do not allow for the economies which would be one important reason for entering an amalgamation. The figures presented here are simply the sum of figures given in budgets of existing districts. The next table presents figures similarly based and shows that the operating cost per student would have been in the region of $626 in 1970. The new district would be very close in many ways to the provincial averages for assessed values, operating costs, and operating mill rates. However, it is important to realize that when the possible economies of operation are considered, it is probable that the budget for School District "A" would be noticeably lower than the simple sum of the budgets of the constituent districts. It is impossible to predice precisely what the cost per pupil for school districts over 10,000 pupils (See Table 2) of $619, the saving on the budget in 1970 would have been $7 per student, or 18,376 x 7 = $128,632 approximately .50 mills.

It has already been suggested that the matter of community involvement might be more vital to a large district than to a small one, because of the tendency ofthe citizens in a large district to see it as remote. Thus the question of community education committees, or some equivalent structure to involve citizens in their school system, should be very carefully considered. The question of trustee representation is important here. Clearly, if as part of their function they are to act as chairmen of community education committees, there is a strong argument for some form of community representation to operate in the election of a school board. This is not within the discretion of the recipients of this report, and thus a recommendation from the consultant would be inappropriate. However, it is perhaps possible that the Department of Education would receive a recommendation from trustees on this matter, and it is suggested that representation in the large district be based on the existing districts to a large extent, and that in a nine-man board this would approximate the following: three representatives from Nanaimo two repreeentatives from Duncan, one representative from Ladysmith, one representtive from Chemainus, and two rural representatives. This proposal, or some modification of it, should probably be adopted at least for an interim period to prevent any reduction of the sense of community involvement in citizens of the new large district. This could develop into a significant problem which

TABLE III - FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF THE PROPOSED SCHOOL DISTRICT "A", ENCOMPASSING THE PRESENT DISTRICTS OF COWICHAN, LADYSMITH, AND NANAIMO*

	New District	SD #65	SD #67	SD #68
Net Operating Budget.....	$ 11,507,196.	$ 3,502,632.	$ 1,832,240.	$ 6,172,324.
Value of Basic Program.....	$ 10,595,594.	$ 3,327,276.	$ 1,488,849.	$ 5,779,469.
Local Share of Basic Program (24.10 Mills).....	$ 6,090,132.	$ 2,124,726.	$ 629,851.	$ 3,335,556.
Government Grant (Operating)..	$ 4,505,462.	$ 1,150,147.	$ 834,452.	$ 2,396,971.
Local Operating Levy in Addition to Basic Levy.....	$ 911,602.	$ 228,059.	$ 367,937.	$ 439,797.
Assessed Values.....	$252,702,600.	$88,162,904.	$26,134,896.	$138,404,800.
Number of Students.....	18,376	5,740	2,493	10,143
Assessed Values per Student...	$ 13,751.	$ 15,359.	$ 10,483.	$ 13,645.
Net Operating Expenditure Per Student.....	$ 626.	$ 610.	$ 735.	$ 608.
Mill Rate (Operating).....	27.70	26.69	38.18	27.28
Debt and Capital Mill Rate....	3.52	3.57	3.38	3.52
Total Mill Rate..... (excluding College Costs)	31.22	30.26	41.56	30.80

	Provincial Average
Assessed Values per Student...	$ 13,669.
Net Operating Expenditure Per Student.....	$ 615.
Mill Rate (Operating).....	28.66
Debt and Capital Mill Rate....	3.97
Total Mill Rate..... (excluding College Costs)	32.63

* All figures, with the exception of the mill rates and local levies, are calculated on the 1970 actual figures in the district. The mill rates and the levies have been calculated on the combined assessed values of the district.

might adversely affect the ability of the large district to win the allegiance of the citizens in the new district.

The difficulties involved in a reorganization of the scope suggested here should not be underestimated. The major concern would probably be with the reorganization and redistribution of duties of the administrative staff. Nothing can be said here about the district superintendents, since they would be re-allocated by the Department of Education. However, the senior board staff would clearly be affected by this reorganization, and some suggestions can and should be made for this change.

The first suggestion is that the change be carefully planned, and that a timetable be set up. Probably, the timetable would be something like the following:

Stage 1. Adoption in principle, by the school boards concerned, of the amalgamation proposal.

Stage 2. Board officials meet jointly to work out a plan for amalgamation, of three or five years' duration.

Stage 3. Presentation of the timetable to individual boards, and to the boards meeting jointly. Approval by the joint boards.

Stage 4. Adoption of a date, in consultation with the Department of Education, for the dissolution of existing boards and the creation of the new school board. (This date would of course be contingent on the plan already developed.)

It seems likely that the existing board offices would be retained, at least for the period of planning towards integration, and probably beyond that, since none of the existing board offices would be adequated for the new district. In fact all of the existing board offices are somewhat overcrowded at present, and a new building might have to be built in any event for the new district.

Since at least two of the school districts are at present somewhat understaffed

administratively, it is not likely that any great savings in administration costs would be encountered during the interim period. Indeed, it might even be necessary to take on additional staff over the period of amalgamation planning. However, there is little doubt that in the long run administrative economies would be achieved.

The staff of the present school district offices would probably not be much affected early in the interim amalgamation period. But as integration proceeded, their duties would clearly change. Some specialization of function would almost certainly become necessary, and it is likely that a redistribution of office staff would take place, so that the budget and expenditure function could be centralized in one particular office, for instance.

The most difficult staff integration problem would certainly be that of filling the position of secretary-treasurer in the new district. The secretary-treasurers of the existing districts are all men of long experience, who are highly regarded by their peers. It would be extremely difficult to administer the large district without the advice of these men, and yet it seems inevitable that two of them would have to accept what would in effect be a loss of status, that is positions as assistant secretary-treasurers. Alternatively, or perhaps as a consequence of this change in status, a functional re-allocation of duties would probably be necessary. The officials concerned would clearly be in the best position to recommend functional specialization, but it might take the form of a budget and expenditures, administration and personnel, and secretary to the board allocation of duties. It would certainly be an error for the trustees of the new district to attempt to operate that district without the advice and experience of the present senior staff. Whatever solution to this problem was found, it should allow for the use of the talents of the people presently on staff.

Two Medium-Sized Districts

This proposal is in essence that of the Stibbs' Report. It suggests that the existing Ladysmith School District be split along the North Cowichan Municipal Boundary, with the southern portion going to School District #65 (Cowichan) and the northern portion going to School District #68 (Nanaimo). The educational effects of this are discussed in detail in the Stibbs' recommendations, and the

discussion here is limited to an examination of the implications for finance and community involvement. However, it should be pointed out that the school districts created by this alternative would have pupil populations of approximately 11,693, and 7,130 based again on 1970 figures. Thus neither one would reach the optimum size of 15,000 recommended in previous amalgamation studies. Nanaimo, with its additional students, would probably not noticeably feel the effect on its educational programs, and the effect on Cowichan School District would probably be also relatively slight. There would be, as pointed out in the Stibbs' recommendation, some distinct advantage to Cowichan School District in providing a somewhat better population for its senior secondary school, and thus allowing it to operate somewhat more economically. There is no doubt that this alternative would provide better access to educational services for the students in School District #67 than they have at present, but its effects on the receiving districts would probably be relatively small.

The financial implications of this alternative are sketched out in the tables which follows. The first table concerns itself with the proposed school district, labelled "B", which would include existing School District #68 (Nanaimo). It can be seen that the hypothetical school district would need a slightly higher mill rate to raise the required local share of the operating funds. The mill rate would have been, in 1970, 4.22 as opposed to the actual 2.83, in the existing Nanaimo School District. The addition of about $14,000,000 in assessed values thus would not quite balance out the addition of some 78 instructional units. However, School District "B" would still be in a relatively good position when compared with the provincial average. The mill rate to raise operating funds would still be noticeably lower than the provincial average, and the net operating costs per student would again be noticeably lower. Thus the financial implications of this alternative for School District #68 and for the northern portion of School District #67 would not be very significant, if existing operating figures were accepted.

This is of course an unreasonable assuption. One of the points argued previously was that the larger the school district, the more economically it was likely to operate. However, the addition of a relatively small number of students to SD #68 would not be likely to improve operating economies very substantially. Thus in this particular alternative, the 1970 figures probably come closer to reflecting the financial situation than in the alternative argued previously. If economies

TABLE IV - FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF THE NEW PROPOSED SCHOOL DISTRICTS, BASED ON THE RECOMMENDATION BY MR. ROY STIBBS*

	SD #68 (Nanaimo)		School Dist. "B"	
Net Operating Budget	$ 6,172,324.		$ 7,546,504.	
Value of Basic Program	$ 5,779,469.		$ 6,904,598.	
Local Share of Basic Program (24.10 Mills)	$ 3,335,566.		$ 3,663,867.	
Government Grant (operating)	$ 2,396,971.		$ 3,240,731.	
Local Levy in Addition To Basic Levy	$ 392,855.	(2.83 Mills)	$ 641,906.	(4.22 Mills)
Debt and Capital	$ 847,358.		$ 994,762.	
College	$ 564,070.		$ 641,607.	
Assessments	$138,404,800.		$152,027,741.	
Pupils	10,865.		12,569.	
Instructional Units	421.		499.	

COMPARISON OF COSTS OF DISTRICT "B" WITH THE PROVINCIAL AVERAGE

	District "B"	Provincial Average
Assessed Values per Student	$ 12,095.	$ 13,669.
Net Op. per Student	$ 600.	$ 615.
Debt and Capital per Student	$ 79.	$ 91.
Total Mill Rate (excluding College Costs)	31.96	32.63

* 1970 Operating and Capital expenditures of SD #67 (Ladysmith) were prorated on the basis of students going to the respective school districts. Using the North Cowichan municipal boundary as line of demarcation, SD #68 (Nanaimo) would absorb 1,704 students, representing approximately 78 instructional units, 75% of operating and capital cost, and 52.12% of the assessed values.

of scale were to be felt here at all, they would likely be rather small.

The benefits to the residents of the northern portion of School District #67 are more noticeable. The 1970 mill rate of the existing school district was 38.18, and this would be substantially reduced by the amalgamation. To raise the operating budget required in 1970, the reduction indicated in the figures would be in the order of 12 mills.

The second school district created by the Stibbs' proposal, School District "C", would have a total enrolment of some 7,130 students and once again, the effect on the existing School District #65 (Cowichan) would be to raise the mill rate very slightly, about .70 for operating costs. There would be an improvement of about $12,000,000 in assessed values, and the new district would again compare quite favourably with provincial averages. The mill rate of 29.83 and the operating cost per student of $555 would be satisfactorily below provincial averages of 32.82 and $615. The effect on the tax-payers in the existing southern portion of School District #67 would again be to substantially reduce their mill rate from the current 38.18 level to 26.68.

Again, these comparisons do not take into account any possible economies of scale from the new district. However, the difference between a district of 5,740 and a district of 6,683 students is probably not significant in terms of financial economies. It is likely that the comparisons here would be quite close to actualities in the final analysis. The possible savings on transporting students who are presently near existing boundaries, as for instance those from Crofton, would probably be absorbed in the additional costs of transporting secondary school students who opted for programs not available to them in the Chemainus Secondary School. It seems unlikely then, in summary, that the financial situation of existing school districts would be very much affected by this amalgamation alternative.

Many of the considerations suggested in the discussion of the previous alternative would also be releveant here, in particular those referring to community involvement and the planning of the integration of the districts. It should be noted that the secondary schools do seem to be the focal point of a considerable amount of local pride and concern, and consequently and proposal that involves closing down the

TABLE V - FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF THE NEW PROPOSED SCHOOL DISTRICT, BASED ON THE RECOMMENDATION BY MR. ROY STIBBS*

	SD #65 (Cowichan)		School Dist. "C"	
Net Operating Budget.....	$ 3,502,623.		$ 3,960,692.	
Value of Basic Program.....	$ 3,327,276.		$ 3,690,996.	
Local Share of Basic Program (24.10 mills).....	$ 2,124,726.		$ 2,426,263.	
Government Grant (Operating)..	$ 1,150,147.		$ 1,264,733.	
Local Levy in Addition To Basic Levy.....	$ 775,317.	(1.98 Mills)	269,696.	(2.67 Mills)
Debt and Capital.....	$ 548,819.		$ 598,021.	
Assessments.....	$ 88,162,904.		$100,674,854.	
Pupils.....	6,187		7,130	
Instructional Units.....	236		264	

COMPARISON OF COSTS OF DISTRICT "C" WITH THE PROVINCIAL AVERAGE

	District "C"	Provincial Average
Assessed Values per Student...	$ 14,119.	$ 13,669.
Net Op. per Student.....	$ 555.	$ 615.
Debt and Capital per Student..	$ 84.	$ 91.
Total Mill Rate..... (excluding College Costs)	29.83	32.63

---

* 1970 Operating and Capital expenditures of SD #67 (Ladysmith) were prorated on the basis of students going to the respective school districts. Using the North Cowichan municipal boundary as the line of demarcation, SD #65 (Cowichan) would absorb 943 students, representing approximately 28 instructional units, 25% of operating and capital costs, and 47.88% of the assessed values.

senior secondary component of the schools in Ladysmith and Chemainus would be quite unfavourably received by the people in the local communities. Thus the real possibility of some damage to community involvement exists with this amalgamation alternative, if not carefully implemented. The same arguments could be presented again for the retention of senior secondary students in existing centres, for the provision that these existing senior secondary schools or components specialize their offerings, for open boundaries so that students who could not receive the educational program they desired in their local school could travel to a larger centre, and for semesters. These elements would probably be as necessary with this alternative as with the one previously argued.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

There are two alternative ways of viewing school districts. One way adopts a society veiwpoint, that is the view that school districts perform, on behalf of society at large, local educational functions. The local school board is then effectively only the arm of society in general, as represented by the Department of Education. Its functions are primarily the adaptive ones of modifying general educational patterns to suit the needs of a local community.

There is however, an alternative view of the school district, the view that the district operates as the educational agency of the local community. The purpose of the school district is to provide opportunities for students in the community, in the light of the educational objectives and needs of the community. From this point of view the function of the central Department of Education is simply to facilitate by providing expert assistance where needed.

The first view has been described as the society view of the educational system. The expectation is that the schools will provide students with appropriate experience to enable them to take their place in the larger society. The second view, the community view, expects the students to be provided with education and training to enable them to take their place in the local community, rather than in the society as a whole. In general, it is the case that school districts in British Columbia have adopted the first view. Assessments of educational programs very generally speak in terms of the scope of the program, and its adequacy in relation to the larger society. It is unusual in British Columbia today for educational programs to be assessed in terms of their acceptability or congruence with the values of the immediate community.

Thus, school trustees facing an amalgamation proposal may be said to be faced with a choice between the society view, or the community view of education. If the school district is currently satisfactory to the community in which it exists, and achieves the purposes of the community, the trustees may well

well feel that they have satisfied their mandate. However, in many cases trustees have adopted a wider view of their responsibilities, and in this case there is probably a fairly simple rule of thumb for school district organization: the larger, the better. Naturally, this cannot be applied to every school district or region; there may be obvious reasons of geography or community feeling for ignoring this. But when trustees are concerned in providing the range of educational opportunities appropriate to the society view of education, the size of the school district becomes a very critical determinant of the program.

In one of the school districts participating in this study, School District #66 (Lake Cowichan), there was effectively a fairly highly-developed community view of the functions of the schools, which was supported by the community. In the case of this school district, it was felt that the geographical and community feeling elements were so significant that it was undesirable to change the status of the district at this time.

For the remaining school districts in the study, amalgamation seems highly desirable from educational and financial points of view. From the point of view of community involvement, it is felt that there is little to be lost and, given appropriate action by trustees in a new school district, possibly some gains to be made.

Recommendations

The main recommendation of this report is that the existing School Districts #65, #67, and #68 should be amalgamated into a single new school district. There would be substantial educational and financial advantages, in the opinion of this consultant, and the community involvement aspect could also be improved if appropriate steps were taken.

There are a number of subsidiary recommendations, which should be regarded as vitally important to the success of the major recommendation. These recommendations are linked in themselves and are presented accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION A

1. Senior secondary schools should be operated on an open boundary system, so that students would have a choice of schools.
2. Senior secondary schools should offer a limited range of program, in the expectation that by specialization, they could achieve excellence.
3. The senior secondary schools in the area should adopt, jointly, a semester system of operation which would allow them to share the services of specialist teachers. This would particularly apply to smaller schools.

RECOMMENDATION B

The adoption of the major recommendations above for the creation of a new school district should be preceded by substantial discussion between the trustees in the districts affected, and between the staffs of the districts. A timetable for integration should be developed after agreement in principle to amalgamation. The timetable should include provision for the drawing of new attendance areas, the setting up of new transportation routes, the integration of budget and financial data, the reallocation of duties of school board staff, and provisions for changes in use of existing district facilities. It is recommended that all of this activity take place in an interim period following the adoption in principle of amalgamation and preceding the legal establishment of the new school district. It is imperative, in the opinion of this consultant, to allow adequate time for a change of this magnitude to take place. An interim period should be allowed for, of at least one year prior to the establishment of the new school district by law, and at least three years for full

integration of district services. Five years might be a better interval for full integration of services.

RECOMMENDATION C

School districts should establish immediately, on a trial basis, community education committees. The duties of these committees would be as described in the body of this report, and they would be under the chairmanship of a school trustee in each case. The adoption of amalgamation in principle should be discussed as an early part of the agenda of these committees, so that the community is able to understand and support the new school district from the very beginning. In the opinion of this consultant, it is imperative that these committees function in the new school district, since because of its size and novelty, it is likely to be inherently suspect.

LIST OF REFERENCES

American Association of School Administrators, School District Reorganization. Washington, D.C.: AASA, 1958.

J.H.M. Andrews, "The Ideology of Local Control", in C.A. Bowers, I. Housego, D. Dyke, eds., Education and Social Policy: Local Control of Education. New York: Random House, 1970.

E. Blumenberg, "School-Community Advisory Council: For Better or for Worse", Journal of Secondary Education, Vol. 46, (Feb.1971).

C. Briner et al, School District Organization in St. Louis County, Missouri: Report of Stage 1 of a Study. Chicago, Ill.: Education Field Services, 1960.

C. Briner, "Administration and Accountability", TIP. Vol. VIII, No. 4, (Oct., 1969).

California State Department of Education, Manual for the Study of School District Reorganization by County Committees. Sacramento, Calif: State Dept. of Education, 1962.

M.A. Cameron, Report of the Committee of Enquiry into Educational Finance. Victoria, B.C.: King's Printers, 1945.

R.F. Campbell, L.L. Cunningham, R.F. McPhee, The Organization and Control of American Schools. N.Y.: Merrill, 1965.

D.K. Cohen, "The Price of Community Control". Commentary, Vol. 48 (July 1969).

J.S. Coleman, "The Struggle for Control of Education" in C.A. Bowers, I. Housego, D. Dyke, eds., Education and Social Policy: Local Control of Education. New York: Random House, 1970.

C. Douglas, "Community School Philosophy". Urban Education, (January, 1971).

M. Fantini, Community Control and the Urban School. N.Y.: Praeger, 1970.

C.O. Fitzwater, School District Reorganization: Policies and Procedures. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1957.

E.H. Goldenstein, "School District Organization and Goals of Social Competence", in R.D. Purdy, The Great Plains School District Organization Project. Lincoln, Nebraska: the Project, 1968.

K. Goldhammer, "Local Provisions for Education: The Organization and Operation of School Systems and Schools", in E.L. Morphet and D.L. Jesser, Designing Education for the Future. N.Y.: Citation Press, 1968.

R. Gray, "Trustee Orientation". Unpublished paper , Vancouver, B.C.: British Columbia School Trustees Association, 1971.

T.F. Green, "Schools and Communities: A Look Forward", in Community and the Schools' Harvard Education Review, Reprint Series No. 3. Harvard Mass.: Harvard Educational Review, 1969.

F. Levirs, East Kootenay Amalgamation Feasibility Study. Vancouver, B.C.: BCSTA, 1971.

M. Lieberman, The Future of Public Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

S.M. Lipset, "The Ideology of Local Control", in C.A. Bowers, I. Housego, D. Dykes, eds., Education and Social Policy: Local Control of Education. New York: Random House, 1970.

E. Litwak, H.J. Mayers, "The School and the Family", in P.F. Lazarsfeld et al, eds., The Uses of Sociology. N.Y.: Basic Books, 1967.

E.J. Maxey and D.R. Thomas, "Selected Comparisons of Teacher and Curriculum Characteristics and Size in High Schools", in R.D. Purdy, The Great Plains School District Organization Project. Lincoln, Nebraska: the Project, 1968.

F.M. Newmann and D.W. Oliver, "Education and Community", in Community and the Schools, Harvard Education Review, Reprint Series No. 3. Harvard, Mass.: Harvard Educational Review, 1969.

E.G. Poling, "Achievement of Students in Selected South Dakota Schools", in R.D. Purdy, The Great Plains School District Organization Project. Lincoln, Nebraska: The Project, 1968.

R.D. Purdy, The Great Plains School District Organization Project. Lincoln, Nebraska: the Project, 1968.

N. Robinson, Reorganization of British Columbia School Districts: The Armstrong Case. Vancouver, B.C.: British Columbia School Trustees Association, 1970.

A. Schwartz, " A Search for Quality in Education", in R.D. Purdy, ed., The Great Plains School District Organization Project. Lincoln, Nebraska: the Project, 1968.

F.D. Stone, "Secondary Education and School District Organization", in R.D. Purdy, ed., The Great Plains School District Organization Project. Lincoln, Nebraska: the Project, 1968.

A.J. Vidich and J. Bensman, Small Town in Mass Society. New York: Doubleday, 1958.

APPENDIX A

THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION COMMITTEE: A VANCOUVER PROPOSAL

The following is a press report of a meeting at which a proposal for community education committees, somewhat like those discussed in this report, was presented by Dr. Peter Bullen, a Vancouver school trustee.

" Vancouver school board's proposed 18 community school committees will do the community the greatest good by keeping educational interests alive and kicking, a board trustee said Tuesday.

These committees would be set up in 18 districts corresponding to secondary school districts and would serve as ombudsmen as well as acting as a liaison organization with the board, Dr. Peter Bullen said.

'I want to involve the community in the school -- the public wants to have some say in the running of the school. These committees could lead to more responsive action on the part of the board,' Bullen said.

'There is very little contact between the Vancouver school board and the electorate. The man in the street would be able to get at what's happening in education.

'I feel that society doesn't really know what it wants from education -- these committees should get more people involved in education and will provide some answers.'

Bullen said he wants people in these proposed committees, not people representing organizations.

'I want people who are representatives of a cross-section of any community,' he said.

Bullen instigated the proposal and last month began to seek reaction from community organizations, school administrators, student councils, unions, and business organizations.

He said the board received 90 letters, 34 favorable and eight opposed to the plan.

Monday, the education and student services committee of which Bullen is a member, held a meeting for people to present briefs on the proposal.

Bullen said more than 90 delegates attended the meeting and gave a favorable reaction.

'The proposal was sent out to make people think about this idea and then to make it better,' he said.

Bullen said the committee would include representatives from the principals, teachers, secondary students and citizens with a liaison school trustee.

'There will be some changes in our proposal which have come from the reaction and comments from the public,' said Bullen."

(VANCOUVER SUN, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1971)

APPENDIX B

THE FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF PROPOSED SCHOOL DISTRICTS "A", "B", AND "C" BASED ON 1971 FIGURES

At the time the report was prepared, complete budget information for 1971 was not available. However, it has recently been pointed out that in some respects 1970 was an atypical year financially for at least one of the participating school districts. Consequently, it seemed desirable to re-draft Tables III, IV and V, on the basis of 1971 figures, for comparison.

The Tables follow:

TABLE VI - FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF THE PROPOSED SCHOOL DISTRICT "A", ENCOMPASSING THE PRESENT DISTRICTS OF COWICHAN, LADYSMITH, AND NANAIMO*

(1971 Figures)

	New District "A"	SD #65	SD #67	SD #68
Net Operating Budget.....	$ 12,185,265.	$ 3,880,993.	$ 1,553,183.	$ 6,751,089.
Value of Basic Program.....	$ 11,897,875.	$ 3,819,294.	$ 1,650,198.	$ 6,428,383.
Local Share of Basic Program (24.5 Mills).....	$ 6,443,945.	$ 2,284,821.	$ 658,426.	$ 3,501,000.
Government Grant (Operating)..	$ 5,453,930.	$ 1,469,381.	$ 991,772.	$ 2,927,383.
Local Operating Levy in Addition to Basic Levy.....	$ 287,390.	$ 381,939.	$ 165,019.	$ 642,537.
Assessed Values.....	$263,018,231.	$93,257,989.	$26,874,532.	$142,885,710.
Number of Students.....	18,825	5,963	2,556	10,306
Assessed Values per Student...	$ 13,971.	$ 15,639.	$ 10,514.	$ 13,864.
Net Operating Expenditure Per Student.....	$ 647.	$ 651.	$ 607.	$ 655.
Mill Rate (Operating).....	25.59	26.67	22.47	27.15
Debt and Capital Mill Rate....	3.85	3.24	3.55	4.31
Total Mill Rate..... (excluding College Costs)	29.44	29.91	26.02	31.56

Provincial Average
(not available for 1971)

* All figures, with the exception of the mill rates and local levies, are calculated on the 1971 actual figures in the district. The mill rates and the levies have been calculated on the combined assessed values of the district.

TABLE VII - FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF THE NEW PROPOSED SCHOOL DISTRICT, BASED ON RECOMMENDATIONS BY MR. ROY STIBBS*

(1971 Figures)

	SD #68(Nanaimo)	School Dist. "B"
Net Operating Budget.....	$ 6,751,089.	$ 7,915,976.
Value of Basic Program.....	$ 6,428,383.	$ 7,666,031.
Local Share of Basic Program (24.5 Mills).....	$ 3,501,000.	$ 3,843,871.
Government Grant (Operating)..	$ 2,927,383.	$ 3,822,160.
Local Levy in Addition To Basic Levy.....	$ 642,537.	$ 249,945.
Debt and Capital.....	$ 1,060,537.	$ 1,225,774.
Assessments.....	$142,885,710.	$156,892,699.
Pupils.....	10,306	12,010
Instructional Units.....	452	534
Assessed Values per Student...	$ 13,864.	$ 13,063.
Net Op. per Student.....	$ 655.	$ 659.
Debt and Capital per Student..	$ 103.	$ 102.
Total Mill Rate..... (excluding College Costs)	31.56	30.48

* 1971 Operating and Capital expenditures of SD #67 (Ladysmith) were prorated on the basis of students going to the respective school districts. Using the North Cowichan municipal boundary as line of demarcation, SD #68 (Nanaimo) would absorb 1,704 students, representing approximately 78 instructional units, 75% of operating and capital cost, and 52.12% of the assessed values.

TABLE VIII - FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF THE NEW PROPOSED SCHOOL DISTRICT, BASED ON RECOMMENDATIONS BY MR. ROY STIBBS*

(1971 Figures)

	SD #65 (Cowichan)	School Dist. "C"
Net Operating Budget.....	$ 3,880,993.	$ 4,269,288.
Value of Basic Program.....	$ 3,819,294.	$ 4,231,843.
Local Share of Basic Program (24.5 Mills).....	$ 2,284,821.	$ 2,597,573.
Government Grant (Operating)..	$ 1,469,381.	$ 1,634,270.
Local Levy in Addition To Basic Levy.....	$ 381,939.	$ 37,445.
Debt and Capital.....	$ 533,952.	$ 589,031.
Assessments.....	$ 93,257,989.	$106,023,390.
Pupils.....	5,963	6,906
Instructional Units.....	253	281
Assessed Values per Student...	$ 15,639.	$ 15,352.
Net Op. per Student.....	$ 651.	$ 618.
Debt and Capital per Student..	$ 89.	$ 85.
Total Mill Rate..... (excluding College Costs)	29.91	27.92

* 1971 Operating and Capital expenditures of SD #67 (Ladysmith) were prorated on the basis of students going to the respective school districts. Using the North Cowichan municipal boundary as the line of demarcation, SD #65 (Cowichan) would absorb 943 students, representing approximately 28 instructional units, 25% of operating and capital costs, and 47.88% of the assessed values.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

63